

## **REMARKS**

In the Official Action mailed on **July 28, 2004**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-24. Claims 1, 9, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (USPN 5,590,197, hereinafter "Chen") in view of Franklin et al. (USPN 6,000,832, hereinafter "Franklin") and further in view of Schneier (*Applied Cryptography 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*, hereinafter "Schneier"). Claims 3-8, 11-16, and 19-24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Franklin and further in view of Schneier.


Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to include allowable limitations from dependent claims 3, 11, and 19, respectively. Dependent claims 3, 11, and 19 have been canceled without prejudice. Dependent claims 4, 12, and 20 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 4-8, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-16, which depend upon claim 9, and claims 20-24, which depend upon claim 17, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: October 20, 2004

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
508 Second Street, Suite 201  
Davis, CA 95616-4692  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665